

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's disclosed Related Art in view of Sagawa et al. (US 6,452,526).

Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's disclosed Related Art in view of Sagawa et al. and Kwon (US 6,577,293).

Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's disclosed Related Art in view of Sagawa et al. and Mitani et al. (US 5,714,953).

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's disclosed Related Art in view of Sagawa et al. and Kwon.

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's disclosed Related Art in view of Sagawa et al. and Mitani et al.

The drawings are objected to for minor informalities.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for indication that claims 4 and 7 contain allowable subject matter.

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicant has not amended any claim. Accordingly, claims 1-7 are pending for consideration.

Applicant concurrently submits herewith a Submission of Replacement Drawings.

Objection to the Drawings

The drawings are objected to for minor informalities. Specifically, the Office Action

alleges that FIGs. 1-3 should be labeled as "Prior Art." Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits concurrently herewith a Submission of Replacement Drawings that includes amended FIGs. 1-3 to include the legend "Prior Art." Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that all the drawing figures comply with MPEP § 608/02(g), and respectfully requests that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's disclosed Related Art in view of Sagawa et al. (US 6,452,526), claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's disclosed Related Art in view of Sagawa et al. and Kwon (US 6,577,293), claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's disclosed Related Art in view of Sagawa et al. and Mitani et al. (US 5,714,953), claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's disclosed Related Art in view of Sagawa et al. and Kwon, and claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's disclosed Related Art in view of Sagawa et al. and Mitani et al.

Applicant traverses these rejections as being based upon combinations of references that neither teach nor suggest the novel combination of features clearly recited in independent claims 1 and 5, and hence dependent claims 2-7.

With respect to independent claims 1 and 5, the applied art, whether taken singly or combined, does not teach or suggest a combination including at least "a plurality of digital to analog converters for converting digital image signals output from the timing controller to analog

image signals based on a color gray level displayed and receiving the selection signal.” In contrast to Applicant’s claimed invention, Applicant’s Related Art data driving circuit does not include a timing controller that outputs a selection signal provided to a plurality of digital to analog converters. Furthermore, contrary to allegations of the Office Action, Applicant’s specification (paragraph [0007]) is completely silent with respect to a digital to analog converter receiving a selection signal, which is output by a timing controller.

Applicant further asserts that the Office Action does not rely on Sagawa et al., Kwon, and/or Mitani et al. to remedy the deficiencies of Applicant’s disclosed Related Art. Moreover, Applicant respectfully asserts that Sagawa et al., Kwon, and/or Mitani et al. cannot remedy the deficiencies of Applicant’s disclosed Related Art.

For at least the above reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-7 are neither taught nor suggested by Applicant’s disclosed Related Art and any of the applied prior art references, whether taken alone or in combination. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103 should be withdrawn.


CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of the response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant’s undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: 
David B. Hardy
Reg. No. 47,362

Dated: August 31, 2004

CUSTOMER NO. 09629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004